SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_47970
Title of the Manuscript:	Pedotransfer functions for estimating saturated hydraulic conductivity of selected benchmark soils in Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed that part in the manuscript. It is feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	 -The presented manuscript is curious and has a lot of references. - It is necessary to show "raw" results of obtained saturated hydraulic conductivity with basic statistical analysis as mean and standard deviations. It is good to present above results on the charts. -The biggest disadvantages in my opinion is estimation of saturated hydraulic conductivity in laboratory using falling head methods. In my opinion in low permeable soil, it's better to use constant head methods (see: Nieć, J., Spychała, M. (2014): Hydraulic conductivity estimation test impact on long-term acceptance rate and soil absorption system design. Water, 6, pages 2808-2820.) 	
Minor REVISION comments	I cannot agree with sentence line 21 to 24. The direct methods are time constraining, and cost inefficient, especially over large scales but they are taking into account soil heterogeneity (especially compare to indirect methods). The laboratory set up (figure 1) should be explained how the soil sample were saturated,	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed ware a comment (if agreed ware a comment of the manuscript. It is mand
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jakub Nieć
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences in Poznan, Poland

d with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight is mandatory that authors should write his/her

vith reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that datory that authors should write his/her feedback here)